



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,961	07/21/2003	Marcia L. Stockton	RSW920030100US1	6051
53792	7590	09/15/2008	EXAMINER	
DILLON & YUDELL LLP 8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY. SUITE 2110 AUSTIN, TX 78759			MEYERS, MATTHEW S	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3689		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		09/15/2008		PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/623,961	STOCKTON, MARCIA L.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	MATTHEW S. MEYERS	3689

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s)       is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s)       is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s)       are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on       is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.      .

    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date      .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date      .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other:      .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claim 1, drawn to a method of managing a computer mass storage system that host a plurality of users, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
  - II. Claim 8, drawn to a method of managing a business or personal computer mass storage system, classified in class 705, subclass 1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as obtaining an agreement to provide a level of erasure and the particulars of doing do. Whereas subcombination II relates to destroying the mass storage system upon the occurrence of a predetermined event. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a

claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

3. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

**Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

4. During a telephone conversation with Brian Russell on 9/4/08 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claim1. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claim 8 withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

5. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted is being considered by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lynne VanArsdale* is senior strategic marketing manager for Quantum (Irvine, CA) and a member of SNIA board of directors (Mountain View, CA), Computer Technology Review, June 2002 (Hereinafter referred to as Service), in view of *Secure Deletion of Data from Magnetic and Solid-State Memory*, This paper was first published in the Sixth USENIX Security Symposium Proceedings, San Jose, California, July 22-25, 1996 (Hereinafter referred to as Secure).

9. Service discloses a method of managing a computer mass storage system that hosts a plurality of users (Service , Page 2, "Risk-based SLAs support an organization's data-protection risk-management strategy. That strategy comes from the identification of risks, prioritization based on the impact and probability of those risks, and service levels targeting the planned risk management scenarios."), the method comprising:

- a. obtaining agreement with a user to provide a level of erasure of hosted data on the computer mass storage system (Service , Page 2, "Risk-based SLAs support an organization's data-protection risk-management strategy. That strategy comes from the identification of risks, prioritization based on the impact and probability of those risks, and service levels targeting the planned risk management scenarios."); and
- b. erasing the hosted data according to the level of erasure that was agreed upon (Service, Page 2, "For example, document storage restrictions may dictate storage on media that will maintain bit-level integrity for a given number of years, not support rewrite, and allow reliable deletion.");
- c. wherein the hosted data is contained in a storage medium of the computer mass storage system and wherein the erasing comprises erasing the hosted data according to the level of erasure that was agreed upon, in response to repurposing the storage medium (Service, Page 2, "For example, document storage restrictions may dictate storage on media that will maintain bit-level

integrity for a given number of years, not support rewrite, and allow reliable deletion.”).

d. Service discloses allowing reliable deletion, but does not explicitly disclose wherein the level of erasure comprises overwriting the hosted data with new data as the new data is generated by another user; bulk erasing the hosted data, wherein bulk erasing comprises one of: single pass bulk erasing the hosted data; or multiple pass bulk erasing the hosted data, wherein multiple pass bulk erasing includes repeatedly bulk erasing the hosted data, with different bulk erasing patterns; and destroying at least a portion of the computer mass storage system that includes the hosted data.

e. However, Secure teaches methods available to recover erased data and presents schemes to make this recovery significantly more difficult (Secure, Page 1). Moreover, the present techniques for data erasure have been used by DOS based programs for years. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings Secure with the Data-protection SLAs in Service in order to provide its clients different levels of erasure increasing with security depending on their risk-management needs.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW S. MEYERS whose telephone number is (571)272-7943. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jan Mooneyham can be reached on (571) 272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew S Meyers/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3689

/Janice A. Mooneyham/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3689